



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/961,055	09/24/2001	Masaaki Hiroki	0756-2367	6718

31780 7590 01/18/2008
ERIC ROBINSON
PMB 955
21010 SOUTHBANK ST.
POTOMAC FALLS, VA 20165

EXAMINER

QI, ZHI QIANG

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2871

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

01/18/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/961,055

Applicant(s)

HIROKI ET AL.

Examiner

Mike Qi

Art Unit

2871

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 December 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 6,7,9,19,21,24-36,39,40,42 and 44-58 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 24-36 and 48-58 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 6,7,9,19,21,39,40,42 and 44-47 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 07/837,394.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 12/14/07.
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 6, 7, 9, 19, 21, 39, 40, 42 and 44-47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US 5,051,570 (Tsujikawa et al) in view of US 4,007,294 (Woods et al), US 4, 924,279 (Shimbo) and further in view of US 4,778,258 (Parks et al).

Regarding claims 6, 7, 9, 39, 40 and 42, Tsujikawa teaches (col.10, line 36 - col.11, line 39; Fig. 9) an electro-optical display device comprising:

- a first substrate (128) having an insulating surface (glass substrate);
- at least one thin film transistor (103,104) formed over the first substrate (128), the thin film transistor (103,104) having a semiconductor film including channel region, source and drain regions, such as electrodes (117,118) with the channel region extending therebetween (the electrodes and the channel region should be formed in a semiconductor layer);
- an interlayer insulating film (122) formed over the thin film transistor (103,104);

- an electrode (such as 118) formed over the interlayer insulating film (122) and electrically connected to the source region or drain region through contact hole of the interlayer insulating film (122);
- a leveling film (123) comprising organic resin formed over the at least one thin film transistor (103,104); because the interlayer insulating film (123) formed of polyimide (organic resin) and functions as flatten the surface as shown in the Fig.9;
- a pixel electrode (124) formed over the leveling film (123) and electrically connected to the source region or drain region of the thin film transistor (103,104) through the electrode (118) as shown in Fig.9;

(concerning claims 9 and 42)

- an electrode (such as 118) electrically connected to the source region or drain region through a first contact hole of the interlayer insulating film (122) as shown in Fig.9;
- the pixel electrode (124) contacts the electrode (118) through a second contact hole of the leveling film (123) as shown in Fig.9;
- the second contact hole does not overlap the first contact hole as shown in Fig.9;

(concerning claims 39, 40 and 42)

- the electro-optical display having an active matrix type display can be used in any electronic device such as camera in the preamble of the claims that are

only given weight as intended use, and that would have been at least obvious.

Tsujikawa further teaches that the gate insulating film is formed of silicon oxide (see col.8, lines 16-18, that is the same as shown in the Fig.9 of the gate insulating film 134,135), but Tsujikawa does not explicitly teach that: 1) the gate insulating film contains fluorine; 2) the gate insulating film covering the semiconductor film and in contact with a top surface and side surfaces of the semiconductor film; 3) the pixel electrode is transparent.

Woods teaches (abstract) that a method of treating a layer of silicon dioxide in which an fluoride compound is applied to one surface of the silicon dioxide layer to prevent the deleterious effect resulting from any mobile impurity ions therein, so that would obtain more protection.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to those skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the electro-optical display device of Tsujikawa with the teachings of the gate insulating film having fluorine as taught by Woods, since the skilled in the art would be motivated for preventing the deleterious effect resulting from any mobile impurity ions therein (abstract).

Tsujikawa and Woods teach the invention set forth above except for that the gate insulating film covering the semiconductor film and in contact with a top surface and side surfaces of the semiconductor film, and the pixel electrode is transparent.

Shimbo teaches (col.2, lines 32-38; Figs.2-4) that the gate insulating film (6) covering the semiconductor film (5) and in contact with a top surface and side surface of the semiconductor film (5), and such TFT can be easily obtained.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to those skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the electro-optical display device of Tsujikawa and Woods with the teachings of the gate insulating film covering the semiconductor film as taught by Shimbo, since the skilled in the art would be motivated for easily obtaining a TFT.

Concerning pixel electrode is transparent that would be a conventional.

Parks teaches (col.5, lines 15-20) in general, pixel electrode having transparent material (transparent pixel electrode), and that is particularly useful in LCD displays in which back lighting is employed to form or assist in forming the desired image.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to those skilled in the art at time the invention was made to modify the electro-optical display device of Tsujikawa, the film treatment of Woods, and the gate insulating film covering the semiconductor film of Shimbo with the teachings of using transparent pixel electrode as taught by Parks, since the skilled in the art would be motivated for achieving a desired image, particularly, for the transmission type liquid crystal display as indicated in paragraph [0147] of this application.

Regarding claims 19 and 44, Tsujikawa teaches (col.11, lines 18-23; Fig.9) that the liquid crystal (125) is disposed between the first substrate (128) and the second substrate (127), and that is conventional.

Regarding claims 21 and 45, Tsujikawa teaches (col.11, lines 30-33; Fig.9) that the leveling film (123) comprises polyimide, because the interlayer insulating film (123) functions as flatten the surface as shown in the Fig.9, such that the interlayer insulating film (123) is a leveling film.

Regarding claim 46, Tsujikawa teaches (col.10, lines 43-55; Fig.9) that the channel region (between the source region and the drain region of the thin film transistor) comprises crystalline silicon.

Regarding claim 47, Tsujikawa teaches (col.8, line 16-18) the gate insulating film comprises silicon oxide (the Fig.6 shows the same as the Fig.9 for the gate insulating film 134, 135).

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments filed on December 14, 2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In response to applicant's arguments that the Office Action does not provide a proper or sufficient reason. It is respectfully pointed out that the prior art of record teach the claimed invention in the combination of the references as set forth above, and the previous rejection set forth above is reasonable as the references teach the limitations as claimed, and that would have been obvious to those skilled in the art to modify the references teachings to achieve the claimed invention.

Conclusion

4. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mike Qi whose telephone number is (571) 272-2299. The examiner can normally be reached on M-T 7:30 am-6:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Nelms can be reached on (571) 272-1787. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number:
09/961,055
Art Unit: 2871

Page 8

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Zlk

Mike Qi
Primary examiner
Jan. 16, 2008